

**FTC 01-25  
CONSTRUCT A MOCK PORT – OF – ENTRY  
AT THE  
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER  
GLYNCO, GA**

**SECTION M  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**SECTION M  
  
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY  
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING CENTER  
PROCUREMENT DIVISION  
BUILDING 93  
GLYNCO, GEORGIA 31524**

## EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

No.	Clause Title	Page No.
<b>M.1</b>	<b>EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS .....</b>	<b>M-1</b>
<b>M.2</b>	<b>RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN COST OR PRICE AND TECHNICAL STRENGTH .....</b>	<b>M-1</b>
<b>M.3</b>	<b>ELEMENTS OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS .....</b>	<b>M-1</b>
<b>M.4</b>	<b>EVALUATION CRITERIA.....</b>	<b>M-2</b>
<b>M.5</b>	<b>COST/PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>M-6</b>
<b>M.6</b>	<b>NOT USED .....</b>	<b>M-6</b>
<b>M.7</b>	<b>CONTRACT AWARD .....</b>	<b>M-6</b>
<b>M.8</b>	<b>ALTERNATE BID ITEM .....</b>	<b>M-6</b>

## **M.1 Evaluation of Proposals**

This section is intended to explain the rational and precise criteria by which proposals resulting from this solicitation will be evaluated. Offerors are advised that they are not restricted as to how their proposal is presented, as long as sufficient information is provided to allow an evaluation of the elements defined herein.

(a) The “Best Value Continuum”: The “best value continuum” (FAR 15.101) will be utilized in this procurement for the evaluation of offers and the selection of the successful offeror to receive the award. The “Source Selection Objective” (FAR 15.302) is to select the proposals that represent the best value. The best value continuum is a method of evaluating cost/price and other factors specified in the RFP with the objective of selecting the offeror with the best overall proposal based primarily upon technical merits with costs and other factors considered as appropriate. The best value continuum provides the opportunity for cost/technical tradeoffs; therefore, award of a resulting contract will not necessarily be made to the lowest priced offer or the highest ranked technical offer.

(b) Proposals shall be evaluated against the standards set forth in the RFP, without regard for the relative strengths and weaknesses of competing proposals.

## **M.2 Relationship Between Cost or Price and Technical Strength**

Offerors are advised that in Proposal evaluation, paramount consideration shall be given to technical proposals rather than cost or price. However, the degree of importance of price as a factor could become greater depending upon the equality of the technical proposals. The greater the equality of proposals, the more important price and other factors become in selecting the best value.

## **M.3 Elements of the Evaluation Process**

(a) Identifying unclear or ambiguous proposal provisions: Language in a proposal may at times be ambiguous and the proposal’s merit will depend on which of two possible meanings is most apparent to the reader. In other instances, proposal language may simply be unclear, and the evaluators may be unable to understand it well enough without guessing at its meaning. In instances of ambiguity the evaluators must indicate the alternate meanings that the language could be given. The evaluators must advise the Contracting Officer when they find they cannot make a sound evaluation because proposal language is ambiguous or cannot be fully understood. Clarification may be obtained from the Offeror, by the Contracting Officer, provided the clarification would not entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely new proposal by the Offeror in question.

(b) Identifying instances, in which the Offeror has failed to provide adequate information: An Offeror will sometimes describe, in general terms, a particular approach for performing some part of the contract, but will not provide enough detailed information to permit an evaluation of its feasibility and

merit. Each instance where this occurs will be identified, wherein the Offeror may be advised that additional information is required to permit sound evaluation. Clarification may be obtained from the Offeror, by the Contracting Officer, provided the clarification would not entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely new proposal by the Offeror in question.

(c) Identifying strengths and weaknesses of proposals: Evaluations will identify strengths and weaknesses of the technical aspects of proposals.

(d) Identifying deficiencies in proposals: Evaluations will identify areas in any proposals that do not meet the requirements set forth in the RFP and/or render the proposal unacceptable. A determination of unacceptable may be based on poor or unsatisfactory past performance of similar work. For each deficiency identified, the evaluation will note an explanation as to why one or more of the requirements were not met, an assessment (with supporting rationale) as to whether the deficiency can be remedied by the Offeror and, an assessment (with supporting rationale) as to whether the deficiency, assuming it is technically feasible, would entail so substantial a revision of the proposal as to amount to the submission of an entirely new proposal by the Offeror in question.

#### **M.4 Evaluation Criteria**

**(a) There are three (3) elements to the Technical Evaluation Criteria and each of these elements has sub-elements: The Government evaluation standard for each element and sub-element is listed below. The Maximum number of points is 100. The maximum number of points for each Factor and Subfactor is listed adjacent to the criteria.**

##### **A. EVALUATION CRITERIA ELEMENTS**

- 1. Past Performance/Experience of**
  - a. Firms**
  - b. Key Personnel**
  - c. Finishes, Mechanical & Electrical Subcontractors**
- 2. Organization, Management and Technical Approach.**
  - a. Quality Control**
  - b. Planned Approach (Including CPM Scheduling)**
- 3. Safety and Environmental Experience**
  - a. Safety**

**4. Section 508 Compliance**

**1. FACTOR: Past Performance/Experience of: 58 Points**

**Subfactor**

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>a. Firm</b>  | <b>20 Points</b> |
| <b>b. Key Personnel</b>   | <b>20 Points</b> |
| <b>c. Finishes, Mechanical &amp; Electrical Subconstruction</b> | <b>18 Points</b> |

**a. Subfactor- Past Performance/Experience of Firm**

**Standard for Evaluation:**

The standard is met when, within the last five years, the offeror was the prime contractor on a minimum of three similar or more complex projects. All projects must have received an overall performance rating of satisfactory or better, and have been completed on time and within budget, and to the satisfaction of the owner.

**b. Subfactor- Past Performance/Experience of Key Personnel**

**Standard for evaluation**

The standard is met when each of the key individuals has experience on at least three similar projects in the last three years, for at least 70 percent of the total project term, in the position or similar position he/she will fill on this project. Also, the references contacted must indicate that the key personnel completed their duties in a timely, professional manner. Any reference ratings below satisfactory from references may result in a reduced rating for this subfactor.

The Project Manager and the Site Superintendent must have a minimum of seven years experience as a superintendent, inspector, QC Manager, project manager, and/or construction manager on “similar” or more complex construction projects.

Quality Control Manger must have a minimum of ten years experience as a superintendent,

inspector, QC Manager, project manager, or construction manager on “similar” or more complex construction projects.

**c. Subfactor – Finishes, Mechanical & Electrical Subconstruction**

**Standard for evaluation:**

The standard is met when, within the last five years, the proposed subcontractors have successfully served, in each of these three trade specialties, as a prime or major subcontractor on a minimum of three “similar” or more complex projects. References give favorable responses to questions on the Past performance Questionnaire, **Section J, Attachment #29**, relevant to past performance of the firm(s). All references contracted should note that previous work was completed timely, within budget, and to the satisfaction of the owner. NOTE: If the Offeror intends to complete one or both these elements of work with their own forces, it should be clearly noted in the technical proposal. However, any such Offeror must clearly evidence in their Proposal that their own forces have successfully met the criteria given herein as the standard for evaluation in each of the three trade specialties.

**2. FACTOR: Organization, Management and Technical Approach: 32 Points**

**Subfactor**

- |   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>a. Quality Control</b>                             | <b>17 Points</b> |
| <b>b. Planned Approach (Including CPM Scheduling)</b> | <b>15 Points</b> |

**a. Subfactor- Quality Control**

**Standard for Evaluation:**

This factor considers the Offeror’s experience in developing and using a detailed Quality Control Plan. While a detailed QC Plan must be developed specifically for this project after award, this factor considers the Offerors knowledge, experience and skills in preparing and executing QC Plans. Offerors shall submit references from three previous projects where a QC plan was specifically required, provided and utilized. The plan to be submitted for this project should be used as a tool to ensure that the work is performed in a rational sequence and that the material and quality of work meets or exceeds the requirements as defined in the specifications and drawings.

**b. Subfactor- Planned Approach (Including CPM Scheduling)**

**Standard for Evaluation:**

The standard is met when the Offerors detailed description demonstrates a thorough knowledge and capability of the firm to provide high quality management and coordination of all skills, trades and subcontractors, safety, submittals, quality control, value engineering, difficult activities, cost control, scheduling, change order management, timely request for information, timely response to Request for Proposals (RFP), and proven communication and coordination skills with respect to owner and subcontractor issues.

Extra consideration can be given to Offerors who solve problems or implemented special workable actions for unique situations.

All references contacted must give a satisfactory or better rating. References contacted should indicate that the projects have been completed by meeting or exceeding the customer's requirements as set forth in the construction contract documents (drawings and specifications). Key reference issues are the demonstrated experience of the contractor to successfully organize and manage the required resources to complete the construction project. This may be measured in terms of timely completion, compliance with established budget, and number of RFIs resulting in contractor request for change orders.

**3. FACTOR: Safety and Environmental Experience: 10 Points**

**Subfactor**

**a. Safety 10 Points**

**a. Subfactor- Safety (Experience Modification Factor)**

**Standard for Evaluation:**

The standard is met when within the last five years, the Offeror has performed three or more projects where a job specific safety plan was required. Note, an EMF rating of 1.0 or less is considered acceptable. If the Offeror submits an EMF rating from their insurance carrier that is greater than 1.0, a detailed explanation as to the cause for the above average rating is required along with a statement of the actions taken to improve safety. An EMF rating of greater than 1.0, with no explanation may result in a reduced technical evaluation for this factor. All references contacted must

give an overall safety rating of satisfactory or better.

**4. FACTOR: 508 Compliance**

**0 Points**

**Standard for Evaluation:**

The standard is met when the items in the Section J “Electronic & Information Technology Accessibility Standards Evaluation” spreadsheet meet the stated requirements. If the items cannot be met due to unavailability of Section 508 accessible products, the offeror must indicate such on the form or provide an item with the greatest degree of compliance.

**M.5 Cost/Price Proposal Evaluation**

For purposes of award the contracting officer will select the best overall proposal based primarily upon technical merits with costs and other factors considered as appropriate. The price proposal shall include the total price of the construction, including material, labor, equipment, overhead, profit, general conditions, and other costs.

The Contracting Officer will use cost and price analysis to evaluate the price proposal, not only to determine whether it is reasonable, as determined by a comparison to the Government estimate and/or the technical advisors, but also to determine the Offeror’s understanding of the work and ability to perform the contract. Price proposals will be evaluated and scored by the Contracting Officer after all technical evaluations have been completed. Unsupported or unreasonable cost proposals may result in discussions with Offerors, or rejection of the proposal in its entirety.

**M.6 NOT USED**

**M.7 Contract Award**

As a basis for award, price is of secondary consideration. THEREFORE, THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO AWARD A RESULTING CONTRACT TO OTHER THAN THE LOWEST PROPOSED PRICE OR THE HIGHEST RANKED TECHNICAL OFFEROR. However, the degree of importance of price as a factor could become greater depending upon the equality of the technical proposals for areas evaluated. The greater the equality of proposals, the more important price and other factors become in selecting the best value to the Government. **All Offerors are cautioned that the Government reserves the right to award this contract without discussion to a technically, qualified Contractor, offering a reasonable price. Note: As for price evaluation purposes, the Government will only consider the base bid and those alternate items which the Government determines it has adequate funding to purchase at time of award.**



## **M.8 Alternate Bid Items**

Sufficient funds may not be available for the award of all the desired construction features for the Mock Port-of-Entry. As a result, the Government has identified contract line item number (CLIN) 0001 as the base bid item. Award of this CLIN shall result in a fully usable facility meeting the needs of the Government. CLINs 0002 through 0008 are alternate bid items that are desired by the Government and shall be awarded in any combination thereof if funding is available. The Contracting Officer reserves the right to award any, all, or none of the alternative bid items at the time of the award of the contract, according to the best interests of the Government. If discussions are opened during the technical review, pricing of the alternate bid items may be included in the discussion.

**End of Section M**